UNITED
NATIONS

DP

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1992/47
4 March 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirty-ninth session
4-29 May 1992, Geneva

REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS ON ITS IN-SESSIONAL MEETING HELD DURING THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL, 10-14 FEBRUARY 1992

Rapporteur: Mr. Ryszard RYSINSKI (Poland)

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	OPENING OF THE MEETING, ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK	1 - 2	2
II.	PREPARATIONS FOR THE FIFTH PROGRAMMING CYCLE: SPECIAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES	3 - 16	2
III.	PROGRAMME PLANNING: COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS	17 - 92	4
IV.	FIELD VISITS	93 - 96	18
V.	FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK	97	18
VI.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS	98	19
VII.	RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS	99	19

Annexes

I.	Terms of reference: Field visits	21
II.	Correspondence on the Special Programme Resources	23

I. OPENING OF THE MEETING, ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

1. The Standing Committee for Programme Matters held an in-sessional meeting during the special session of the Governing Council convened in New York from 10 to 14 February 1992. The Vice-President of the Governing Council, H.E. Mr. Martin Adouki (Congo), served as Chairman of the Committee. Mr. Ryszard Rysinski (Poland) was elected Rapporteur.

2. At its 1st meeting on 11 February 1992, the Standing Committee adopted its agenda and tentative schedule of work contained in document DP/1992/L.2. The Standing Committee also agreed to maintain a flexible schedule of work.

II. PREPARATIONS FOR THE FIFTH PROGRAMMING CYCLE: SPECIAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES

3. For its consideration of this subject, the Standing Committee for Programme Matters reviewed the report of the Administrator on preparations for the fifth programming cycle entitled "Special Programme Resources: programming documents" (DP/1992/7).

4. The Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Policy, Programme and Evaluation, introduced the item by referring to the extensive review process leading to the finalization of document DP/1992/7, including revisions in accordance with views expressed by delegations at previous sessions.

5. The Assistant Administrator recalled that the Governing Council had decided in September 1991 that, as an exceptional procedure, all revised documents would be considered approved on a no-objection basis. This meant that discussion would not be reopened provided that the revisions adequately reflected the views expressed by the Standing Committee. To allow members to determine whether the revisions met this requirement, a draft version had been circulated to Council members in November. Two delegations had suggested further amendments in writing. Since these amendments were considered to be of a clarifying nature rather than substantive changes, they had been distributed as a conference room paper. He proposed that, if no member objected, they should be incorporated in the final document. On this basis, he proposed that the Standing Committee recommend to the Governing Council that it approve the Special Programme Resources (SPR) programming documents contained in document DP/1992/7.

6. Many delegations commended UNDP for the work undertaken in revising the earlier proposals and in presenting programme documents which reflected their concerns in each of the areas identified for SPR support.

7. With regard to the proposed programme reserve of $10 million for category A. Disaster mitigation, the new programme proposals suggested that it be allocated equally to programmes A1. Disaster preparedness and

management, and A4. Refugees, displaced persons and returnees. This was proposed in light of General Assembly resolution 46/182 of 19 December 1991, which places emphasis on the smooth transition from relief to rehabilitation and development, and on the importance of disaster preparedness and disaster mitigation activities, which are most closely linked to these two subcategories. One delegation considered that changes in the wording of paragraphs 78 and 80 of subcategory A4 should be revised, and this was accepted.

8. Two new programmes which had not been discussed earlier were being submitted, namely those relating to technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC) (B4), and the transfer and adaptation of technology for development (B5). Many delegations commented favourably on the proposals for B4 and B5.

9. With respect to the TCDC proposal, some delegations urged that greater use be made of the modality and that additional and more diverse sources of finance and expertise be mobilized. Greater attention should also be given to follow-up and to evaluation and to using the SPR programme for promotion purposes. One delegation emphasized the role that non-governmental organizations, specifically the private sector and individual scientific relationships, can play in TCDC, and in this connection, the importance of early resolution of the current debate in international forums with regard to intellectual property rights.

10. Concerning subcategory B5. Transfer and adaptation of technology for development, the Assistant Administrator noted that the document included comments on the findings of evaluations of 32 projects undertaken in the fourth cycle with the aim of promoting the transfer of science and technology. In paragraph 80 of the document, the lessons learned were summarized, including the need for linkages between education, research and production, the role of private enterprise, the importance of sustainability and networking with both producers and users, the policy environment required for promoting human development concerns and the institutional capacities required to bring this about. One delegation suggested that the promotion of technology transfer should take into consideration existing regional and interregional networks and should give opportunities to scientific and technical expertise from developing countries to succeed. For it to succeed, it was stressed that attention should be given to identifying barriers to the participation of third world scientists in the network, and to making recommendations accordingly. These suggestions were accepted for inclusion in the revised document. One delegation expressed the hope that UNDP should support to a greater extent the efforts of some countries to update their obsolete technologies and to adopt environmentally sound ones.

11. The availability of the SPR will enable UNDP to pursue the transfer of technology and TCDC in the fifth cycle in a more systematic manner. The policy environment and agents of technological change will be the first targets for action, with particular attention to linkages with women in development, the environment and TCDC and the needs of small- and medium-scale

enterprises. A working group composed of representatives of the major United Nations system specialized agencies with competence in this field had been established to draw on their expertise and achievements and to monitor jointly with them the progress in developing the technology theme.

12. The report also included the subcategory C6. Social dimensions of adjustment, which was being redesigned pending the formulation of a proposed core project in the regional programme for Africa. It would be submitted to the Standing Committee at a later date for its full consideration.

13. Most delegations endorsed the proposals and recommended their approval. They urged that the extensive debate which had taken place at the previous meeting of the Committee should not be reopened. They considered that any further views that delegations might have should be taken into consideration during implementation.

14. One delegation indicated that its comments on certain programmes, which had been made in an exchange of correspondence with UNDP, had not been incorporated into the document. They had, however, been received after the revised draft had been sent for printing. UNDP had acknowledged them in its subsequent reply and had agreed to take them into consideration in subsequent programme implementation. The delegation requested that the comments be formally added to the document.

15. Each of the programme proposals was then approved individually, under the no-objection principle (see decision I, para. 2). Those programmes on which comments needed to be taken into consideration were approved with the proviso that action would be taken during the subsequent process of detailed programme design and implementation.

16. Finally, two delegations commented on the need to expedite SPR programme implementation, in close consultation with the relevant agencies and the Office for Project Services (OPS); to encourage field offices to make proposals for eventual SPR funding; to take full account of the views of recipient countries; and to strengthen the regional and subregional components of the Gulf Task Force recommendations.

III. PROGRAMME PLANNING: COUNTRY AND INTERCOUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND PROJECTS

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

17. The country programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which has an indicative planning figure (IPF) of $24.9 million, including a carry-over of $2.5 million and $0.7 million in cost-sharing, has the following areas of concentration: (a) efficiency and sustainability of agricultural development; (b) energy efficiency; (c) environment and industry; and (d) international economic cooperation.

18. Particularly significant in the country programme are UNDP's role as a major supplier of technical cooperation, concentrating on the six areas of focus of Governing Council decision 90/34; its neutral position manifested by assistance in the disarmament process linked to human development, the first of its kind for UNDP; support in establishing the country's first free economic and trade zone; and the close linkages maintained by the national programme and several regional and subregional programmes, particularly the Tumen River Development programme.

19. Three delegations made observations on the country programme and endorsed it for approval. One delegation suggested that to avoid ecological degradation, the two programmes identified in the first area of concentration mentioned above might be integrated into one. The same delegation also considered that success in the trade and investment area would require that more room be given to market forces rather than to the strengthening of institutions which channel and process trade and investment information.

Maldives

20. The country programme for the Maldives, which has an IPF of $6.8 million, plus a carry-on from the fourth cycle of $180,000 and cost-sharing of $1.5 million, has the following areas of concentration: (a) human resource development for capacity-building; (b) decentralization and integrated development in support of growth with equity; and (c) management for sustainable development.

21. Those parts of the programme that were highlighted related to the country's high dependence on tourism and fisheries, both of which are heavily dependent on external factors, and the corresponding need to strengthen its indigenous economic and human resources base.

22. Two delegations welcomed the orientation of the country programme and felt that it was well focused, particularly regarding capacity-building, management development and environmental and institutional-strengthening. They also stressed the need for further clarification on how the stated goal of greater self-reliance would be achieved and on the need for UNDP to play a greater role in aid coordination and management. It was also requested that progress would be reported on the occasion of the mid-term review on further shifts towards a small number of strategically important activities.

Viet Nam

23. The Resident Representative presented the Viet Nam country programme (IPF of $92.8 million less a negative carry-over of $6.2 million borrowed in the fourth cycle), which will concentrate on the following areas: (a) support to the economic reform process; (b) support in key human development fields; (c) sustaining and strengthening economic performance; and (d) support for environmentally sustainable growth and human settlements development.

24. The highlights of the programme are the special role of UNDP as Viet Nam's primary development partner in the absence of other major multilateral and bilateral donors; its role in helping to build up an enabling environment for economic reform and investment; and its aid coordination and resource mobilization activities.

25. The country programme document was very well received by a large number of delegations represented in the Standing Committee. A total of 13 delegations took the floor in support of programme approval. They commended the Resident Representative for his clear and comprehensive presentation, and for the important role UNDP is playing in Viet Nam.

26. Most speakers emphasized the special role of UNDP as a privileged partner in Viet Nam's development efforts and endorsed the Resident Representative's plea for increased external assistance to offset the fall in assistance from traditional donors from Eastern Europe. In that respect, the Resident Representative's efforts in paving the way for renewed assistance from international financial institutions and in organizing a round-table meeting in early 1993 were commended. One delegation made reference to the importance of an appropriate climate for increased external assistance.

27. In reply to queries, it was emphasized that aid coordination, which would become crucial with the expected increase in aid flows, was the responsibility of the Government but that UNDP cooperation in the process was highly appreciated. Further transparency was required in the exchange of information among donors and more recent information was required from all sources to build up a meaningful database. It was agreed that impact indicators were still too general in the country programme document but that particular attention would be given to devising them in the necessary detail, in programme and project documents. The pace of the introduction of national execution would depend on national capacity in that regard.

Sri Lanka

28. The Resident Representative presented the Sri Lanka country programme ($56.3 million IPF, including a carry-over of $11.2 million from the fourth cycle), which has the following areas of concentration: (a) consolidation of an outward-looking, open-market economy; (b) public sector management of the development process; (c) human development and poverty alleviation; and (d) management of natural resources and the environment. These are consistent with global concerns as articulated in Governing Council decision 90/34.

29. The presentation highlighted the collaborative nature of the country programming exercise, which included an assessment of the performance of the fourth country programme, in-depth consultations with the Government on its development objectives, plans and priorities, and a number of sectoral reviews carried out with the involvement of the United Nations specialized agencies as well as consultations with other multilateral and bilateral donors active in Sri Lanka through the ongoing aid coordination process.

30. The Committee's attention was drawn to the fact that Sri Lanka has one of the highest human development rankings relative to its gross national product (GNP). This has clear implications for its development strategy, which places the highest priority on economic growth, job creation and public sector reform. The Government recognizes that its development strategy must focus on economic growth and human development, including poverty alleviation. The country programme seeks to strike a balance between these two imperatives.

31. Many delegations supported the programme, noting its four areas of concentration, and that it was generally well balanced and well structured with regard to Government priorities. They also felt that the programme was well suited to UNDP strengths and technical cooperation capacities. Based on the January 1992 visit of SCPM members to Sri Lanka, the close cooperation between the Government and the UNDP field office to achieve effective use of UNDP resources was confirmed.

32. As regards the substantive thrust of the programme, many delegations endorsed the emphasis on consolidating the open-market economy and public sector reform, which it felt was appropriate in the Sri Lankan context. They also endorsed the focus on human development and poverty alleviation. One member of the Committee queried whether women's issues were accorded sufficient attention. In reply, the Resident Representative stated that since Sri Lanka's achievements on that score were impressive and while such issues were definitely a priority concern in the country, the issue was naturally accorded a relatively lower priority in the country programme than would be appropriate in some other countries.

33. Some delegations noted the efforts being made in the management of the programme to reduce the number of independent UNDP-supported projects. They felt that these efforts should continue. Several members also felt that the performance indicators at the thematic level were rather general; however, the Committee was assured that more specific indicators would be included at the project/programme level. The movement towards a programme approach and capacity-building for national management was also supported.

34. In response to a question relating to implementation problems arising from the brain drain and the shortage of counterpart funds, the Resident Representative agreed that both were problems which needed to be addressed. He noted that the brain drain represented an awkward issue as it was largely the result of the pull of the external labour market, as well as of the large number of highly skilled Sri Lankans who were attracted to work abroad. He further noted that counterpart funds were generally less of a constraint in technical cooperation than in capital assistance projects funded by the major donors.

Colombia

35. The fifth country programme for Colombia has an IPF of $11.7 million, less a negative carry-over of $1.2 million from the fourth programme, and

cost-sharing of $62.2 million, giving total resources of $72 million. It is estimated that additional complementary resources of some $59.1 million will be mobilized.

36. The country programme covers four thematic areas in which UNDP has comparative advantages: (a) social development and the elimination of poverty; (b) economic liberalization and productive development; (c) territorial development and the modernization of the State; and (d) sustained environmental development. They coincide with objectives of the national plan and are consistent with Governing Council concerns as articulated in its decision 90/34.

37. The cooperation strategy of UNDP aims at strengthening specific areas of Government capacity, paying particular attention to four main functions: (a) the design of national programmes and mechanisms for institutional action; (b) the implementation of innovative actions which could generate replicable sectoral and regional models; (c) the promotion and mobilization of resources for cooperation; and (d) the strengthening of procedures for the follow-up and assessment of the efficiency and impact of national programmes.

38. The fifth country programme for Colombia was extremely well received by the delegations represented in the Committee. Six delegations took the floor in support of the programme's approval and commended the Resident Representative for his clear and comprehensive presentation. Most delegates emphasized the suitability of the programme for Colombia, given the profound changes that the country is experiencing. The successful coordination role of UNDP was stressed and it was noted that the Special Cooperation Plan for Colombia, prepared with the assistance of UNDP, provided the frame of reference for other donors. The trust of the Government and other donors in the programme was reflected by the substantial amount of cost-sharing contributions made. The Government's commitment to the fight against drugs was commended and it was hoped that UNDP would continue to assist in the coordination efforts for the provision of assistance by donors in such an important area.

39. In reply to queries, the Resident Representative emphasized the efforts of the Government in preparing a national cooperation programme with the assistance of UNDP through the national technical cooperation assessments and programmes (NaTCAP) methodology in order to strengthen the management of external cooperation. He added that the programme foresees the participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in several activities, particularly in the process of decentralization to the level of the municipalities and communities and in assistance to the areas of conflict as well as in strengthening the institutional capacity of the confederation of NGOs. Finally, the Resident Representative stressed that the fifth country programme would contribute significantly to the process of change initiated by the Government towards a society which was more just, democratic and respectful of human rights.

Ecuador

40. The fifth country programme for Ecuador has an IPF of $11 million and $15 million in cost-sharing; it should be emphasized that this amount will probably increase during the cycle through joint Government/UNDP resource mobilization efforts.

41. The programme is focused on three areas of concentration: (a) diversification of the economy; (b) poverty eradication; and (c) rationalization of public sector management. These coincide with the areas of focus for capacity-building recommended in Governing Council decision 90/34.

42. Within this framework, the principal objective is to assist the Government in the formulation of policies, strategies and programmes in those priority areas that will allow the country to move towards a more equitable and economically sustainable society. Given the limited resource availability, the IPF will be used mainly as seed money and for rapid disbursement to mobilize additional resources from multilateral and bilateral sources.

43. The country programme was commented upon favourably by eight delegations. Three speakers commented upon the need to ensure adequate impact through concentration of UNDP resources, especially in view of the scatterization experienced during the fourth cycle, mentioning that the present programme represents a step in the right direction. One delegate emphasized the need for careful coordination of external cooperation within the donor community. Another intervention focused on the involvement of NGOs and the private sector as active participants in the fifth cycle. One delegation stressed the importance of UNDP taking into account the interests of the indigenous population in every rural development programme. Another delegation expressed concern that there is insufficient emphasis on market-oriented approaches and that this is true with respect to several components of the programme. One example relates to the importance of privatization as an alternative to public sector restructuring.

44. In reply, the Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean emphasized that dispersion is being minimized through concentrating UNDP interventions not only in a reduced number of areas but within each area so as to ensure that the role of UNDP is commensurate with resource availability and its comparative advantages. In order to provide the country with the necessary resources for controlling its economic and social development process, UNDP resources would be oriented to (a) upstream activities related to policy formulation and the design of national programmes; (b) the systematic introduction of the programme approach; and (c) the creation of national capacities. The Regional Director confirmed the use and promotion of NGOs and the private sector, particularly in the support to microenterprises.

Peru

45. The fifth country programme for Peru has an indicative planning figure of $13.3 million, less a negative carry-over from the fourth cycle of $2 million, and cost-sharing of $33 million, giving total resources of $44.3 million. A total of $202.3 million has been identified, in complementary assistance from other sources to be used in the areas of concentration.

46. The programme has the following areas of concentration: (a) State reform; (b) the employment and social development programme; (c) recovery of the production sector; and (d) environmental and natural resource conservation policy.

47. UNDP's role is based on the high level of trust and dialogue between UNDP and the Government, and has been conditioned on the one hand by the very modest level of IPF resources in relation to the country's needs, and, on the other hand, by the very significant resources the international community is prepared to channel to the country in support of the Government's proven commitment to a policy of economic and social reform.

48. The country programme for Peru was very well received by the delegations represented in the Standing Committee. Eight delegations took the floor in its support. Most delegations commended the strategy and the contents of the programme and considered it viable given the comparative advantages developed by UNDP in the country during the fourth cycle, and the response of the international community to Government initiatives. The areas of concentration clearly responded to national priorities, but further description of some of the areas would clarify UNDP's contribution to the national programmes. Their impact should be carefully evaluated during the mid-term review. The focus on capacity-building was considered most adequate and in this context, education and human resource development should be strengthened.

49. The Regional Director of the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean appreciated the comments of the delegates and emphasized the support given by the Government to the strategy of the country programme. He shared the concern of some delegates that a minimum national capacity should exist to implement national programmes and that it should relate to normal functions of Government institutions, while special units should be used only temporarily for the execution of loans from the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). In that context, he stressed the close relationship between UNDP and the two banks and mentioned the example of the support given by UNDP for the preparation of project proposals for IDB financing at the time when the Bank could not operate in the country. Finally, the Director assured the Committee that the comments of the delegates will be taken into consideration in the context of the mid-term review.

Chad

50. The fourth country programme for Chad, which was originally planned for 1992-1996 was shortened by one year to cover the period 1992-1995. As a result of the reduction, the original indicative planning figure (IPF) of $46,330,000 will be reduced to $31,994,000 after reflecting a fourth cycle borrowing of $6 million. Cost-sharing contributions from the Government and bilateral donors amounting to $3,630,000 will be added to the IPF, thus resulting in an overall total of $35,624,000 for the 1992-1995 period.

51. The three priority themes selected for the new programme are: (a) human development; (b) development of productive resources; (c) management of the development process. Particularly worth highlighting are the human resources development activities in the next country programme: (a) basic education at all levels, with particular emphasis on young girls and women; (b) basic health services in low-income areas and among underprivileged segments of society, including maternal and child health care; (c) the development of appropriate technology and training in its use for rural population, especially in the areas of water supply, agricultural transformation and conservation and basic production implements.

52. Five delegations made observations on the country programme and endorsed it for approval. Two delegations emphasized the importance of aid coordination in the particular context of Chad and therefore of close consultations between the Government and the donor community with the support of UNDP. One delegation drew the attention of the Governing Council to ensure that the projects in the rural development area avoid ecological degradation, and in particular, asked that attention be given to the conflicting interests of sedentary farmers and pastoralists in the use and division of land. Two delegations expressed concern for the high level of military expenditures and asked that the concern be conveyed to the Government. With regard to technical cooperation, one delegation stressed the importance of an increased use of volunteers and tighter association of non-governmental organizations in the implementation of the programme. One delegation wished that more attention be paid in the national technical cooperation assessments and programmes exercise to the modalities of technical cooperation rather than to its costs. Another delegation commented that the programme should have addressed more directly the issue of national capacity-building and national execution and how UNDP resources will support both.

Zambia

53. The country programme for Zambia has an indicative planning figure of $31.6 million, less a negative carry-over from the fourth cycle of $3.1 million. It has the following areas of concentration: (a) agricultural development; (b) industrial development; (c) economic planning and management; (d) education and training; and (e) women in development. The country programme also focuses on human development and, in particular, on the social dimensions of the Government's economic recovery programme.

54. During the discussion, it was highlighted that the new Government, which took office following the general election in October 1991, has endorsed the thrust of the country programme, which they consider to be in line with its priorities, particularly as regards its direct support to the ongoing economic recovery programme. Private sector development is an additional area of concentration which was identified by the new Government for UNDP assistance. Comments were made that the programme needed more focus and concentration and that it needed a more coherent strategy to achieve the objectives.

55. Eight delegations made observations on the country programme. One delegation noted that since the country programme was prepared before the new Government took office, the country programme was somewhat out of date, and, in the absence of an analysis of the new Government's policies, it was thus difficult to say if it was in line with the Government's priorities. A suggestion was therefore made that since the current National Development Plan ended in 1993, an interim programme for two years should be approved, instead of the full country programme. This would enable a new programme to start in 1994, which would reflect the Government's priorities and coincide with the Government's planning cycle. Several delegations emphasized the need for greater efforts by UNDP in support of donor coordination. One delegation commented that the document's assessment for public sector reform was overoptimistic, and that close attention needed to be paid to the area.

56. The country programme was recommended for approval as presented, on condition that an advance mid-term review would be carried out in 1993 which will take the form of a full-scale programming exercise. The results of this exercise would then be submitted to the consideration of the Governing Council, either in the form of a revised programme or a new country programme 1994-1998 (see decision II, para. 2).

Senegal

57. The country programme for Senegal has an IPF of $31.4 million, less a negative carry-over from the fourth cycle of $2.8 million, and cost-sharing of $820,000. Complementary assistance from other sources to be used in the areas of concentration amounts to $59.5 million. The areas of concentration are: (a) human development; (b) sustainable development; (c) private sector development and employment; and (d) strengthening of planning and management capacities.

58. The country programme concentrates on problems considered critical for the restructuring of the economy and conforms to the main priorities of national strategic objectives and programmes. The four areas of concentration are in line with Governing Council decision 90/34, especially with reference to the recommended themes of poverty eradication and grass-roots participation in development; environment problems and natural resources management; management development; and women in development.

59. Four delegations welcomed the orientation of the country programme and endorsed it for approval. Two delegations specifically welcomed the effort of

the United Nations Development Programme to coordinate its cooperation with national programmes and other donor activities. They also stressed the need for better translation of well-determined priorities into concrete programmes. One delegation suggested that the four areas of concentration should be reduced to three and that these thematic areas should be converted into more tightly focused ones. One delegation mentioned that its multi-bi cooperation with UNDP in Senegal had deteriorated seriously because of the unsatisfactory performance of UNDP in Senegal, and expressed its reservation on the approval of the country programme, but did not wish to block it. One delegation commented that the programme does not reflect drug abuse at all and that the programme requires a more specific indication of how private sector development will be promoted.

Comments on the extensions of country programmes

Burundi

60. The Administrator informed the Standing Committee of the one-year extension of the fourth country programme for Burundi.

61. One delegation made observations on the extension, emphasizing the need for more focus in the programme, as recommended in the mid-term review and to strengthen the leadership role of UNDP in the coordination of external assistance to the country.

Congo

62. The Administrator informed the Standing Committee of the one-year extension of the third country programme for the Congo.

63. Two delegations made observations on the extension. One delegation encouraged UNDP to associate itself with the initiatives being undertaken by bilateral donors in preparation for the national election process. A second delegation emphasized the complementarity of the UNDP programme and the bilateral assistance programme from his country to the Congo and wished to strengthen cooperation between it and UNDP. Reference was made to areas such as rural development, private sector development, support to the chambers of commerce, employment, the fight against AIDS, and education reform. He also inquired about the status of the agricultural extension project, which had been subject to delays in the disbursement of a World Bank loan.

Rwanda

64. the Administrator informed the Standing Committee of the one-year extension of the fourth country programme for Rwanda.

65. One delegation made observations on the extension. Reference was made to the structural adjustment programme and it was suggested that UNDP expand its involvement in private sector development, increase participation of women in the development process, strengthen national management capacity and improve

the coordination of external assistance. The same delegation also urged better coordination and synchronization between UNDP, UNIFEM and UNFPA programmes in Rwanda.

66. Another delegation, referring to the political, economic and social situation, thanked the delegations for their observations and indicated that his delegation might wish to make a statement at the thirty-ninth session on efforts made by the Government to face the various problems it had encountered.

Anguilla

67. The Administrator informed the Standing Committee of the one-year extension of the first country programme for Anguilla.

68. No comments were made by delegations on this extension.

Ghana

69. The Administrator informed the Standing Committee of the one-year extension of the fourth country programme for Ghana.

70. One delegation noted the impressive steps taken in recent years by Ghana to restructure its economy, and that the UNDP programme accords well with this reorientation. It also was glad to note that UNDP in Ghana is responsive to its mandate to promote national execution, that the country is well-equipped to realize this objective, and that a consolidation of projects into programme categories was favoured.

71. This delegation also noted the full participation of United Nations agencies in UNDP activities, but requested more information on the status of the NaTCAP exercise in Ghana, and how useful it has been. Finally this delegation expressed appreciation for UNDP's coordinating role in Ghana.

Pakistan

72. The Administrator informed the Standing Committee of the one-year extension of the fourth country programme for Pakistan.

73. No comments were made by delegations on this extension.

Global and interregional programmes

74. The global and interregional programmes have indicative planning figures (IPFs) of $179 million ($112 million global IPF and $67 million interregional IPF). In addition, there is a $3 million carry-over from the fourth cycle and $35 million in cost-sharing, for a total of $217 million. The programmes have the following areas of concentration: (a) social development and poverty eradication; (b) environment and natural resources; and (c) public sector management.

75. During the discussions, comments were made by nine delegations and concentrated on (a) linkages between upstream research supported by the global programme and its application and dissemination in developing countries; (b) the distinction between global and interregional programmes on the one hand and Special Programme Resources (SPR) on the other; and (c) the need for further refinements on the strategy of the UNDP global and interregional programmes. These refinements will be provided through more precise analytical presentation to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session.

76. The changes in global and interregional programmes in comparison with earlier submissions to the Governing Council were highlighted as well as the comparative advantage of these programmes, particularly their catalytic role in creating partnerships among donor and recipients to respond in a coordinated manner to developing country needs. It was also emphasized that fifth cycle global and interregional programmes were more focused than in the past.

Comments on the country programme process

77. A number of delegations expressed their views on the process of preparing, focusing and monitoring country programmes. They were supportive of the efforts made to date and noted considerable improvements in the country programmes presented. They recognized that over the past few years, UNDP and Governments had taken the first steps towards transforming UNDP country programming from simply preparing a document for Governing Council approval once every five years, to a continuing programming process involving an ongoing dialogue between UNDP and the recipient Government on the one hand, and between UNDP and its partners within the United Nations system, on the other.

78. It was considered that still much remains to be done: first to concentrate UNDP cooperation in those areas where UNDP has a comparative advantage, and second to ensure that country programmes evolve from the current grouping of activities under thematic headings to coherent strategies for assisting Governments to achieve national development objectives.

79. Genuine concern was also expressed on the part of some member countries that the shift from projects to thematic groupings of activities had resulted in a loss of information to the Governing Council. It was felt that UNDP was abandoning the project concept, with years accumulated experience behind it, for the programme approach, which they feared might result in a loss of accountability for the use of UNDP resources. On the other hand, one delegation indicated that the shift from the project to a programme approach necessarily will lead to a need for less information as details but should instead lead to a stronger focus on strategies and approaches chosen in order to realize the objectives.

80. UNDP was urged to demonstrate that the programme approach would not become a convenient label for budget support of clusters of recipient Government activities, coordinated by a UNDP-financed programme management

unit. It was recommended that before moving to the programme approach, UNDP must ensure that coherent programme strategies are in place, through dialogue with Governments, and technical support and capacity-building assistance. The result should be a policy-oriented framework for the identification, formulation and evaluation of development cooperation activities, whether packaged as programmes or projects.

81. At the same time, it was recommended that whatever the level of assistance provided by UNDP in the development of programme strategies might be, the strategies must be translated into national programmes which are truly owned and managed by cooperating Governments, for which considerable capacity-building may be needed, including accountability for the use of UNDP resources.

82. The transition from a country programme based on a thematic grouping of projects to one based on coherent strategies is a necessary first step towards a programme approach to technical cooperation. However, it was recognized that the implementation of a fully-fledged programme approach required that (a) national agencies and institutions must develop the necessary programme management capacity; (b) UNDP field offices must have adequate staff with the necessary skills in the areas of programme analysis, monitoring and evaluation; and (c) optimum use must be made of the country-level expertise of the United Nations system. It was also considered that decentralization of decision-making to field offices is necessary for the programme approach to be effective.

83. One delegation raised several further points on the country programming process. It suggested that recipient country representatives be more involved in the consideration of their respective programmes prior to their approval. It emphasized the need for thorough mid-term reviews at a timely stage of the cycle. It proposed that programme extension documents should in future include information on significant changes in funding or programming arrangements since the Council's last consideration of the programme. It finally proposed that the Administration should, for reasons of economy, reconsider the need for, and length of, the Administrator's note on the country programme.

84. It was suggested by several delegations to have a special agenda item on general aspects of country programmes at future sessions of the SCPM.

Response of the Administration on the comments on the country programme process

85. The Assistant Administrator and Director of BPPE thanked delegations for their most useful comments on the country programme process. He was pleased to note general support of UNDP efforts to reorient country programmes in line with the concerns of the Governing Council and to develop new approaches which would help recipient countries to tackle their development problems and to achieve maximum impact from limited UNDP resources.

86. In this respect, he urged delegations to give copies of their comments in writing to the secretariat, so that these could then be transmitted to the relevant Resident Representatives. He considered this was particularly important if field offices were to be able to follow up on those concerns systematically, since it was recognized that such comments, presented verbally by delegations, could never be fully reflected in reports of the Standing Committee.

87. With respect to some of the specific comments raised, he noted that concern had been expressed by some delegations about the potential loss of detail in country programmes, compared with earlier documents. He indicated that in future country programme documents should be considered more in terms of country strategy documents, which would highlight the functional roles of UNDP in selected areas of concentration, and in terms of the particular country-specific comparative advantages of UNDP. As a result, and given space constraints, the provision of detailed programme and project information might not be feasible. New guidelines had already been issued on the preparation of country programme documents, as a revision of a chapter of the Programme and Projects Manual (PPM), which could be available to interested delegations. This chapter included a specific section on "Strategy for UNDP cooperation".

88. With respect to performance indicators on expected impact, the Assistant Administrator also mentioned that in a short country programme document, designed to put the emphasis on strategy, it was not always possible to provide detailed performance indicators. Nevertheless, he acknowledged that greater effort needed to be made in this regard, and was pleased to note that many country programmes, which would be submitted to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session, had provided information on expected impact. He mentioned that the most appropriate place for detailed indicators would be in individual programmes and projects, to be identified at the formulation stage, with the results assessed in subsequent mid-term reviews. In this context, it was agreed that greater importance would be given to the mid-term review as a means of examining progress in achieving objectives. New guidelines for mid-term reviews are under preparation.

89. With regard to the Administrator's note on the country programmes, the Assistant Administrator saw no objection to discontinuing its preparation as a formal requirement, although it might be useful to retain it for those country programmes for which a separate communication from the Administrator might be merited.

90. He also regretted the delay in the receipt of some documents by delegations and promised that the Secretariat would try to rectify this situation.

91. With respect to the comments on the programme approach, he advised delegations that progress had been made in clarifying the concepts and the procedures and that further work was under way. He was pleased to note that a number of promising examples of countries using the programme approach did exist, whose experience would be of wider application.

92. Lastly, he acknowledged the need to provide more substantive detail in country programme extension documents, by including significant changes in funding or programming arrangements, and promised that those concerns would be reflected in future instructions to field offices.

IV. FIELD VISITS

93. Field visits were carried out in January 1992 by members of up to eight delegations of the Governing Council in three regions, namely Africa: Tanzania and Botswana; Asia and the Pacific: Sri Lanka and Indonesia; and Arab States: Egypt and Morocco.

94. Reports of the visits were presented to the Standing Committee and subsequently discussed in an informal session. The reports covered a number of themes of particular interest to the Governing Council, for instance those relating to country programming, especially the advisory notes and country programme preparation; the programme approach; the comparative advantages of UNDP and United Nations specialized agencies; United Nations system coordination; national execution; national technical cooperation and assessments; TCDC; common premises; human immune deficiency virus infection/acquired immune deficiency syndrome (HIV/AIDS); United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA); administrative and organizational matters; implementation of Governing Council decisions.

95. The delegations concerned thanked UNDP for organizing the visits, which were considered to be extremely useful for the participants themselves and for the field offices, their staffs and their government counterparts. It was recognized that the visits had enabled the participants to gain a clearer and more comprehensive understanding of the realities of UNDP work in the field, and to expose UNDP offices to the particular concerns of the Governing Council. It was also considered that the informal discussions on the report had been very useful.

96. Several delegations stated that the experience gained through the January field visits should be used to draft terms of reference that would guide recipient countries, future delegations and field offices participating in field visit exercises. The chair recommended that a working group, made up of representatives from the January 1992 field visits, prepare such terms of reference. The terms of reference are included in annex I.

V. FUTURE PROGRAMME OF WORK

97. With regard to its future programme of work, the Standing Committee decided that the position reflected in paragraphs 124 and 125 of the report of the Committee contained in document DP/1991/72 be reviewed at the in-sessional meeting of the Standing Committee for Programme Matters during the thirty-ninth session of the Governing Council in May 1992.

VI. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS

98. At its 7th meeting, on 14 February 1992, the Standing Committee for Programme Matters adopted its draft report.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAMME MATTERS

99. Following its consideration of the items before it, the Standing Committee recommended that the Governing Council adopt the following draft decisions:

DRAFT DECISION I

Special Programme Resources

The Governing Council

1. Appreciates the efforts of the Administrator in the preparation of the programming documents contained in document DP/1992/7;

2. Approves the programming documents for the allocation of Special Programme Resources contained in document DP/1992/7 on the understanding that (a) comments received from delegations will be taken into consideration with the proviso that action would be taken during the subsequent process of detailed programme design and implementation and (b) subcategory C6. Social dimensions of adjustment will be redesigned and resubmitted for the full consideration of the Council at its thirty-ninth session (1992).

DRAFT DECISION II

Country, intercountry and global programmes

The Governing Council

1. Approves the following country programmes:

Fifth country programme for Chad	DP/CP/CHD/5 and Corr.1 DP/CP/CHD/NOTE/5
Fifth country programme for Colombia	DP/CP/COL/5 DP/CP/COL/NOTE/5
Third country programme for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea	DP/CP/DRK/3 and Corr.1 DP/CP/DRK/NOTE/3

Fifth country programme for Ecuador	DP/CP/ECU/5 DP/CP/ECU/NOTE/5
Fifth country programme for Maldives	DP/CP/MDV/5
Fifth country programme for Peru	DP/CP/PER/5 and Corr.1 DP/CP/PER/NOTE/5
Fifth country programme for Senegal	DP/CP/SEN/5 and Corr.1 DP/CP/SEN/NOTE/5
Fifth country programme for Sri Lanka	DP/CP/SRL/5 DP/CP/SRL/NOTE/5
Fourth country programme for Viet Nam	DP/CP/VIE/4 and Corr.1 DP/CP/VIE/NOTE/4

2. Approves the fifth country programme for Zambia (DP/CP/ZAM/5 and Corr.1 and DP/CP/ZAM/NOTE/5 and Corr.1) on the condition that an advance mid-term review will be held in early 1993, which will take the form of a full-scale programming exercise; the results of this exercise will then be submitted for the consideration of the Governing Council, in the form of either a revised programme or a new country programme for the period 1994-1998;

3. Takes note of the extension by one year of the following country programmes:

Extension of the first country programme for Anguilla	DP/CP/ANL/1/EXTENSION I
Extension of the fourth country programme for Burundi	DP/CP/BDI/4/EXTENSION I
Extension of the third country programme for Congo	DP/CP/PRC/3/EXTENSION I
Extension of the fourth country programme for Ghana	DP/CP/GHA/4/EXTENSION I
Extension of the fourth country programme for Pakistan	DP/CP/PAK/4/EXTENSION I
Extension of the fourth country programme for Rwanda	DP/CP/RWA/4/EXTENSION I

4. Approves the global and interregional programmes for the fifth programming cycle (DP/INTGLO/2 and Corr.1), subject to further refinements to be brought before the Council in May 1992 as stated in DP/1992/SCPM/L.1/Add.7.

Annex I

TERMS OF REFERENCE: FIELD VISITS
(UNDP/UNFPA)

1. Length of visit

The team will spend at least five working days in each country visited.

2. Focus of visit

The team shall select at least four from the following list of programme issues:

(a) National execution/national capacity-building;

(b) United Nations system coordination, including common premises;

(c) Programme approach;

(d) Communication;

(e) Importance and relevance of Governing Council decisions;

(f) Process of preparing the country programme;

(g) Technical cooperation among developing countries (TCDC);

(h) HIV/AIDS.

The team may select additional issues as appropriate. The Resident Representative shall have the opportunity to suggest additional issues.

3. Mission contacts

(a) The mission shall meet with as many of the following representatives as possible:

(i) UNDP and UNFPA field staff at all levels, including a separate meeting with the administrative officer;

(ii) United Nations agency staff;

(iii) Project directors and technical advisers;

(iv) Government ministries responsible for aid coordination, finance, and planning as well as relevant sectoral ministries;

(v) Non-governmental organizations;

(vi) Other donors (bilateral, World Bank, etc.).

Sufficient time should be provided for these meetings so as to encourage a thorough dialogue among those in attendance. Some of these meetings may be held without UNDP officials.

(b) The team shall visit at least four projects, and visits to projects outside the capital are strongly encouraged. At least two of the visits should be to UNFPA projects. The team may consider splitting up to facilitate these visits;

(c) The field visits is to be a working mission of the SCPM. Its purpose is to enhance the dialogue between individual members of the SCPM and relative UNDP/UNFPA field representatives and government officials. Courtesy and protocol visits shall be kept at a minimum.

4. Participation

(a) The selection of participants should adhere to decision 91/2. It should include up to 10 representatives of the SCPM, excluding any UNDP headquarters staff that may accompany the team;

(b) Equitable gender representation should be encouraged in the formulation of each team.

5. Selection of countries

The selection of the countries to be visited (no more than two per field visit) and the timing of the visits should be determined by the SCPM based on consultations among appropriate UNDP and government officials.

6. Communication

(a) The team shall inform the field office through UNDP headquarters, at least six weeks in advance, of the specific focus of the visit;

(b) The field office shall provide background material at least two weeks in advance of the visit. The material should consist of the country schedule for the visit, a country programme background paper (e.g. aides-memoire, country programmes), donor profiles, a detailed list of projects to be visited, and a brief issues paper;

(c) Travel information for all the participants shall be confirmed by UNDP headquarters no later than one week prior to the departure date;

(d) UNDP headquarters shall facilitate the timely exchange of the above information between the field office and team members.

Annex II

CORRESPONDENCE ON THE SPECIAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES

A. Letter dated 16 January 1992 from the Officer-in-Charge, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation, to the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, United States Department of State

Subject: Special Programme Resources (SPR) Document

Thank you very much for your 17 December letter to Mr. Gus Edgren on the above subject.

Please find below additional comments and clarification on the points which you raised in your letter. In some cases you will note that your concerns had already been addressed in the final version of the documentation to be submitted to the Council. In certain other cases, while it was too late to include any additional revision in the documentation, we will take your concerns into account as we proceed with actual implementation of the sub-programmes.

Sub-category A1: Disaster Preparedness and Management

We confirm that the Disaster Management Training Programme (which is the main vehicle for the formal training referred to under this category) indeed has both indigenous and international NGOs among its audiences. In fact, for planning purposes, we have assumed that an average of 6-8 of the 30 participants in DMTP country workshops will be drawn from the NGO community.

Sub-category A2: Emergency Relief

We are unsure of the precise meaning of this comment. Under previous SPR cycles, responses by UNDP for emergency relief grants have been very carefully coordinated with UNDRO at the headquarters level. Coordination at the field level is automatic, given that UNDP resident representatives are ex officio representatives of UNDRO.

The decision of the September 1991 SCPM to limit UNDP relief grants for affected populations to inputs which do not fall within the mandate of other United Nations organizations by definition means that the "criteria for project approval" will have to differ from those of UNDRO. In particular, where SPR relief phase grants are made under the provisions of paragraph 46 [i] of the programme document, they will have to differ widely as UNDRO emergency grants are not given to the provisions of paragraph 52 (a) in the unedited version of the SPR programme document which states that allocations are dependent upon either an UNDRO international appeal or by a decision by the multi-agency United Nations Disaster Management Team.

Sub-category B1: Poverty Eradication and Grassroots Participation in Development

Poverty is a multi-dimensional problem, and in order to develop strategies for poverty eradication, a multi-disciplinary and cross-sectoral approach is needed. It is our view, which is shared by most international development agencies, that any strategy for poverty eradication should focus on at least four dimensions; (a) the macroeconomic policy level; (b) the access of the poor to productive assets, including land, credit, technology, information; (c) the design and outreach of social service delivery systems; and (d) the opportunity of the poor to influence their own destiny, i.e. the participatory dimension.

The examples given in the programming document of possible activities to be supported under this sub-category should be seen as an effort to address all these interlinked aspects of poverty, i.e. to adopt a holistic approach. The objective is to be able to provide advice to governments and support team in testing methods to build the capacity of national systems to address the poverty problem. Different countries may wish to focus on one or several of these dimensions, depending on which appear to be the major road block(s) to improving the position of the poor in that particular country. We cannot see how we could defend eliminating any of these four dimensions from our attention under the SPR.

The fifth activity listed, the Partners in Development Programme, is an important mechanism of direct intervention which reaches out to the grassroots level. However, as also underlined in the recent evaluation report on this programme, it has also been instrumental in exposing UNDP field offices directly to realities of people at the grassroots level and as such, is a key element in enabling us to improve our understanding of human development. It has been strongly supported by several members of the Governing Council, one of which has recommended an increase in the allotment for this programme.

Sub-category B2: Enviromental Problems and Natural Resources

Management

General:

The Programming document for Environment and Natural Resources has been revised to incorporate the written comments of the United States delegation. The revised draft was also submitted informally for comments. Further changes were incorporated to take into account the suggestions made during this consultation.

Specific:

Comment: Provision should be made to require the incorporation of environmental considerations in all UNDP funded projects and the role of the Environmental Management Guidelines.

Response: The process of the Environmental Management Guidelines is meant to address this concern. The newly revised Manual now makes this a prerequisite. The SPR document also suggests assigning some SPR resources for the purpose of improving the environmental dimension of ongoing programmes and projects.

Comment: An informal mechanism should be established to review the EMG prior to implementation.

Response: This consultation has taken place. As a result of this consultation, some excellent suggestions/recommendations have been incorporated in the final version.

Comment: The document should explain how UNDP will continue to expand its environmental and natural resource management activities.

Response: The new document emphasizes the catalytic role of SPR and the linkages with other funding sources and programmes all of which will act to expand and make more effective the environment and natural resources management activities in UNDP.

Sub-category B3: Management Development

Strategic management means to ask fundamental questions about institutions concerning purpose, objectives, orientation, resources, competence, performance, and effectiveness. On this basis, MDP experts work with clients to design and carry out sustainable improvements. They craft specific designs and executing arrangements based on particular strategic settings. The use of a process approach ensures that clients assume responsibility for their programmes.

As decided by the Governing Council, the MDP is available to all countries wishing to participate. However, only about one half of the countries that have requested MDP assistance have successfully completed all the steps leading to project approval. The main reason is that many potential clients are not yet ready to ask the fundamental questions listed above, and to design programmes to address the issues raised. Although the MDP's scope is potentially broad and complex, the individual country programmes approved each have a sharp conceptual and operational focus.

Sub-category C1: Human Development Report

The following represents the breakdown of planned annual expenditures on the Human Development Report.

		US$
-	Background research and studies by international and national experts and organizations	350 000
-	Preparation or draft chapters	60 000
-	Design, editing, etc.	80 000
-	Preparation of report-related papers and brochures (e.g. HD profiles, region-specific and issue-specific reports)	50 000
-	Three technical workshops on the outline, background studies, and draft of the report	100 000
-	Projection measures (including translation of the report into different languages)	240 000
-	Consultancy services in the area of statistics/ computer-programming	30 000
-	Operating expenses	90 000
	TOTAL	1 000 000

Sub-category C8: Private Sector Development

Concerning the above sub-category, you may wish to note that considerable debate has taken place during the 46th session of the General Assembly on this subject. Resolution 46/166 titled "Entrepreneurship" sponsored by the United States and some 50 countries, has, inter alia, recognized the action undertaken by the Governing Council of UNDP in this regard including the allocation of SPR funds during the 5th cycle. The above General Assembly resolution assigned a special responsibility to UNDP in view of the importance of technical assistance in helping Governments promote entrepreneurship particularly through Private Sector Development.

As stated in the document, we are fully cognizant of the need to ensure complementary use of SPR funds with those of country, regional, interregional and global funding, as well as other donor sources.

In this context, the activities carried out by UNDP under this sub-category can play a key role in the promotion of the human development concept by encouraging human creativity, expanding economic and social options and broadening the participatory nature of the development process called for under Governing Council decision 90/34.

We are fully in agreement with you on the need to prioritize the broad activities which will be funded from SPR sources under this sub-category in order to ensure maximum impact and catalytic use of these resources on IPF funded activities. This could be determined following the next plenary session of the Governing Council in its discussion of the Administrator's report on this subject called for under Governing Council decision 91/11.

We will be glad to try to respond to any other questions that you might have and hope that you will find the above comments useful.

We hope that on this basis your Government will be able to support the Administrator's recommendation for approval of the entire SPR programme at the special session of the Governing Council in February 1992.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed) Sarah L. Timpson
Officer-in-Charge
Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation

B. Letter dated 17 December 1991 from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, United States Department of State, to the Assistant Administrator and Director, Bureau for Programme Policy and Evaluation

We have completed our review of UNDP's revised Special Program Resources (SPR) programming documents. Although not all of our suggestions for improvement were incorporated in the revisions, with a few exceptions, we are pleased with the revised documents. Nevertheless, we still feel that some documents need further revision before the Governing Council can approve those specific documents.

As I stated in my 22 November letter to you, it was agreed to and noted in the September report of the Standing Committee for Program Matters (SCPM) that the Administration was to provide detailed revisions by 1 November for full consideration by the Committee. We received the revised documents on 18 November. It was also noted that members had 30 days to share their concerns in writing with the Secretariat so that they could be included in the presentation to the February Special Session of the Governing Council. We received the documents on 20 November, and notified you of our intention to share our concerns by 17 December.

Those concerns and our suggestions for improvement of the documents still requiring further revision follow:

Sub-category A1: Disaster Preparedness and Management

In describing the strategy for achieving the specific objectives under this sub-category, the revised programming document indicates that formal training in disaster management will be provided to government representatives. The strategy should include training of representatives from indigenous non-governmental organizations as well.

Sub-category A2: Emergency Relief

The specific criteria for project approval needs to be better defined, making sure that it is appropriately linked with UNDRO's criteria for project approval.

Sub-category B1: Poverty Eradication and Grass-roots Participation in Development

As we commented earlier, the range of activities proposed in this revised document continue to be too broad and diffused. The revision only eliminated the specific examples of activities to be undertaken, but kept the same broad areas of activities. Until activities under this sub-category are better focused on fewer areas, the United States would find it difficult to approve this programming document.

Sub-category B2: Environmental Problems and Natural Resources Management

This revised programming document should contain a provision that would require the incorporation of environmental considerations in all UNDP-funded projects. It should also make clear that funding under this sub-category should have a catalytic effect and projects should be related to development. These requirements should also be made applicable to ongoing UNDP-funded projects.

UNDP's activities in the environmental field (including activities under this SPR sub-category) will be based on the Environmental Management Guidelines (EMG). An informal mechanism with the participation of member country NGOs and Governments should be established to review the EMG before they are implemented. The process would allow UNDP to benefit from the expertise already developed by these entities.

The document should explain how UNDP will continue to expand its environment and natural resource management activities.

(We understand in our conversations with Luis Gomez-Echeverri from the Environment and Natural Resources Group that the document we received in November has been revised further to better reflect the above concerns. If this is the case, we should be able to approve the programming document under this sub-category.)

Sub-category B3: Management Development

We had suggested last fall that the programming document needs a sharper conceptual and operational focus. This suggestion was not incorporated in the revised document. We still believe that the document's scope is too broad and complex if it is seen as responding to all the major development management needs of all countries. The document is still not sufficiently focused for quality technical support, for cumulative learning and for coordination with similar support programmes of other donors.

The revision also did not address our concern regarding the need for a sharper focus on "strategic management", keeping in mind that each country presents a particular situation calling for a different approach to management development. The concept of "strategic management" should be clearly defined in the programming document. Until these changes are made, we can not approve the document.

Sub-category C1: Human Development Report

The revised programming document did not take into account our concerns regarding breakdown on the financing of the report. We understand from the September meeting of the Standing Committee that this information is available. It should be included.

Sub-category C8: Private Sector Development

The document should integrate the principle of private sector development with the other activities to be funded under this SPR category. It should not be limited necessarily to activities under this sub-category.

The document should be more selective in the activities to be funded. It should establish priorities for the expenditure of the limited funding allocated for this sub-category, budgeting specific amounts for each activity selected. At minimum, there should be a statement acknowledging the importance of prioritization and committing to an early establishment of priorities as well as budget amounts.

We appreciate the seriousness with which you and your staff have taken this whole process. The effort involved by all was extremely valuable. Ultimately, UNDP and its member States will have reasonably good quality documents to guide the programming of SPR funds.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Melinda L. Kimble
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Bureau of International Organization Affairs